

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 25 were pending in the application at the time of examination. Claims 1 to 19, 21, 22 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated. Claims 20, 23, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable

Applicants have amended the description to correct grammatical errors.

Claims 1 to 24 are amended to more clearly recite the invention. The amendments make explicit that which was implicit in the claims when the claims were interpreted in view of the level of skill in the art and the disclosure as required by the criteria of the MPEP and the courts. The amendments are made to avoid a discussion on whether Applicants are requesting the examiner to read limitations from the specification into the claims.

Claims 1 to 19, 21, 22 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by European Patent Publication N. 855659 A1, hereinafter referred to as Gabber. With respect to Claim 1, the rejection stated, in part:

requesting user data (Fig. 2 and 3 and column 9 line 50 to column 10 line 15, also mentioned in column 12 line 45 to 48) from a user-controlled secured device (which may be the user device itself, or the peripheral proxy server as described in column 1 line 15 to 15 [Sic] and also in column 12 line 31 to 33) if a network site that requires user data is accessed (column 14 line 9 to 16) said requesting occurring prior to requesting said user data from another device; and sending said user data to a network server associated with said network site if said user data is received from the said [Sic] user-controlled secure device (column 14, line 9 to 16).

Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of Claim 1. With respect to Figs. 2 and 3, Gabber taught:

Exemplary interface 305 prompts a user of site 105a to enter . . .

Gabber, Col. 10, lines 1 to 2.

Thus, Gabber fails to disclose

requesting user data from a user-controlled secure storage device

as recited in Claim 1. Entering data in a browser interface teaches way from such a request. Further, the rejection has failed to cited any teaching of:

said requesting occurring prior to requesting said user data from another device

Applicants respectfully note that to support an anticipation rejection, the MPEP requires that Gabber show "The identical invention . . . in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim." MPEP, §2131, 8th Ed., Rev. 3, p. 2100-76 (August 2005). Since Gabber fails to teach either the specific request from a user-controlled secure storage device, or the timing of the request as recited in Claim 1, Gabber fails to show the invention in as complete detail as recited in Claim 1. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 1.

In the anticipation rejection of Claim 2, the rejection stated in part:

receiving a request for user data (column 13 line 34 to 35); returning said user data if said user data is found and if returning user data for said request is enabled and if said user data comprises static user data(column 13 line 35 to 41); reconfiguring said user data if said user data is found and if returning user data for said request is enabled and if said user data comprises dynamic user data(column 13 line 50 to column 14 line 5); and returning said reconfigured user data(column 14 line 6 to 16) .

Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of Claim 2. Grabber, Col. 13, lines 34 to 41 taught:

Nonetheless, after central proxy system 100a obtains the required information about the user, the above described third routine removes portions of the browsing commands that would identify the user site 105a to server site 110g, and forwards user site 105a's original request to access NYT-site 110g. . .thereby selectively excluding from the request header-fields or the like that may identify the user.

There is no teaching in the section of the central proxy receiving a request for the user data. Also, the data is not returned but is forwarded. Forwarding data teaches away from returning data as recited in Claim 2 and is but further evidence that the section fails to teach or suggest the receiving operation. Finally there is no teaching of three requirements that must be met before the returning is done, specifically,

- [1] if said user data is found . . . and
- [2] if said returning user data for said request is enabled and
- [3] if said user data comprises static user data

as recited in Claim 2. As quoted above, the only requirement is that the proxy obtains the data. Thus, the cited section fails to show "The identical invention . . . in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim." MPEP, §2131, 8th Ed., Rev. 3, p. 2100-76 (August 2005).

Similarly, Col. 13, line 50 to Col. 14, line 16 describe what is substituted for the user name etc. by the proxy server when the New York Times Web site is visited for the first time. Again, the reference taught that these actions were performed irrespective of any conditions. Thus, at multiple levels the

reference fails to teach exactly the invention of Claim 2. In addition, since the reference teaches that a proxy server performs the interactions, this further teaches away from the operations being performed by any user device. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 2.

With respect to the anticipation rejection of Claim 3 cited to Col. 8, lines 15 to 50 of Gabber. However, this section is directed at "use of site-specific identifiers to eliminate the need for a user to 'invent' a new user name and password for each server site, which requires the establishment of an account," and the operations are described as being performed on the cited server. This teaches or suggests nothing about a server determining the particular type of data, static or dynamic, and then taking actions and using the data based on the determination. Accordingly, Gabber fails to teach the same invention to the same level of detail as recited in Claim 3. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 3.

Claim 4 stand rejected for the same reason as Claim 1 and the rejection additionally cited to Col. 18, lines 1 to 23 of Gabber as teaching use of cookies. Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of Claim 4.

First, Applicants note that in the rejection of Claim 1, the rejection cited to Figs. 2 and 3. With respect to Figs. 2 and 3, Gabber taught:

Exemplary interface 305 prompts a user of site 105a to enter . . .

Gabber, Col. 10, lines 1 to 2.

Combining a cookie, which the user does not control, with entry of data by a user is a modification of Gabber and so the rejection is not well founded. The general discussion of

cookies in Gabber provides no rationale for the change and provides no teaching to the same level of detail as

requesting a cookie from a user-controlled secure storage device

as recited in Claim 4. Entering data in a browser interface combined with general knowledge of cookie use teaches way from such a request. Further, the rejection has failed to cited any teaching of:

said requesting occurring prior to requesting said cookie from another device

Applicants respectfully note that to support an anticipation rejection, the MPEP requires that Gabber show "The identical invention . . . in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." MPEP, §2131, 8th Ed., Rev. 3, p. 2100-76 (August 2005). Since Gabber fails to teach either the specific request from a user-controlled secure storage device, or the timing of the request as recited in Claim 4, Gabber fails to show the invention in as complete detail as recited in Claim 4. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 4.

Claim 5 stand rejected for the same reason as Claim 2 and the rejection additionally cited to Col. 18, lines 1 to 23 of Gabber as teaching use of cookies. Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of Claim 5.

First, Applicants note that in the rejection of Claim 2 and hence in the rejection of Claim 5, the rejection cited Column 13, lines 34 to 35 of Gabber, which stated:

Nonetheless, after central proxy system 100a obtains the required information about the user, the above described third routine removes portions of the browsing commands that would identify the user site 105a to server site 110g, and forwards user site 105a's original request

to access NYT-site 110g. . .thereby selectively excluding from the request header-fields or the like that may identify the user.

There is no teaching in the section of the central proxy receiving a request for a cookie. There is no teaching that a cookie includes browsing commands that can be stripped as taught by Grabber. Accordingly, the combination cited in the rejection requires a modification of the cited section and so is inappropriate for an anticipation rejection. Also, forwarding data teaches away from returning the cookie as recited in Claim 5 and is but further evidence that the section fails to teach or suggest the receiving operation. Finally there is no teaching of three requirements that must be met before the returning is done, specifically,

- [1] if said cookie is found . . . and
- [2] if said returning said cookie for said request is enabled and
- [3] if said cookie comprises a static cookie

as recited in Claim 5. As quoted above, the only requirement is that the proxy obtains the data. Thus, the cited section fails to show "The identical invention . . . in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." MPEP, §2131, 8th Ed., Rev. 3, p. 2100-76 (August 2005). Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 5.

With respect to the anticipation rejection of Claim 6, Claim 6 stands rejected for the same reason as Claim 3 and the rejection additionally cited to Col. 18, lines 1 to 23 of Gabber as teaching use of cookies. Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of Claim 6.

The rejection of Claim 3 cited to Col. 8, lines 15 to 50 of Gabber and so this portion of Gabber is directed to Claim 6.

Again, there is no teaching or suggestion of how a cookie would be substituted in the operations described at Col. 8, lines 15 to 50. Moreover, Col. 8, lines 15 to 50 is directed at "use of site-specific identifiers to eliminate the need for a user to 'invent' a new user name and password for each server site, which requires the establishment of an account." This teaches or suggests nothing about a server determining the particular type of cookie, static or dynamic, and then taking actions and using the cookie based on the determination. Accordingly, Gabber fails to teach the same invention to the same level of detail as recited in Claim 6. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 6.

Claims 7 and 13 are directed to a program storage device and an apparatus that each includes limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 1. Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 7 and 13. The above remarks with respect to Claim 1 are applicable to each of Claims 7 and 13 and are incorporated herein by reference. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 7 and 13.

Claims 8 and 14 are directed to a program storage device and an apparatus that each includes limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 2. Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 8 and 14. The above remarks with respect to Claim 2 are applicable to each of Claims 8 and 14 and are incorporated herein by reference. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 8 and 14.

Claims 9 and 15 are directed to a program storage device and an apparatus that each includes limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 3. Applicants

respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 9 and 15. The above remarks with respect to Claim 3 are applicable to each of Claims 9 and 15 and are incorporated herein by reference. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 9 and 15.

Claims 10 and 16 are directed to a program storage device and an apparatus that each includes limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 4. Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 10 and 16. The above remarks with respect to Claim 4 are applicable to each of Claims 10 and 16 and are incorporated herein by reference. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 10 and 16.

Claims 11 and 17 are directed to a program storage device and an apparatus that each includes limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 5. Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 11 and 17. The above remarks with respect to Claim 5 are applicable to each of Claims 11 and 17 and are incorporated herein by reference. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 11 and 17.

Claims 12 and 18 are directed to a program storage device and an apparatus that each includes limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 6. Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 12 and 18. The above remarks with respect to Claim 6 are applicable to each of Claims 12 and 18 and are incorporated herein by reference. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 12 and 18.

The anticipation rejection of Claim 19 includes the rejection of Claim 13 that in turn included the rejection of Claim 1 plus the citation to a browser. Again, Applicants note that the operations cited again Claim 1 were performed by a proxy system as quoted above. Accordingly, to move these operations to a browser requires a modification of Gabber, which is a demonstration that Gabber fails to teach the invention to the same level of detail as recited in Claim 19. In addition, the above remarks with respect to Gabber and Claim 1 are applicable and are incorporated herein by reference. Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 19.

The anticipation rejection of Claim 21 includes the rejection of Claim 15 that in turn included the rejection of Claim 3 plus the citation to a server. Again, Applicants note that the operations cited again Claim 3 were performed by a proxy system as quoted above. Accordingly, to move these operations to the cited server instead of the proxy system requires a modification of Gabber, which is a demonstration that Gabber fails to teach the invention to the same level of detail as recited in Claim 21. In addition, the above remarks with respect to Gabber and Claim 3 are applicable and are incorporated herein by reference. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 21.

The anticipation rejection of Claim 22 includes the rejection of Claim 19 that in turn included the rejection of Claim 13 that in turn included the rejection of Claim 1 plus the citation to a browser and cookies. Again, Applicants note that the operations cited again Claim 1 were performed by a proxy system as quoted above. Accordingly, to move these operations to a browser requires a modification of Gabber, which is a demonstration that Gabber fails to teach the invention to the same level of detail as recited in Claim 22.

In addition, the above remarks with respect to Gabber and Claims 1 and 4 are applicable and are incorporated herein by reference. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 22.

The anticipation rejection of Claim 24 includes the rejection of Claim 21 that in turn included the rejection of Claim 15 that in turn included the rejection of Claim 3 plus the citation to cookies. Again, Applicants note that the operations cited again Claim 3 were performed by a proxy system as quoted above. In addition, the above remarks with respect to Gabber and Claims 3 and 6 are applicable and are incorporated herein by reference. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 24.

Claims 20, 23, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gabber as applied to Claim 16 and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0011250, herein after referred to as Paltenghe.

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejection of Claim 20. Applicants note that the rejection of Claim 20 refers to the rejection of Claim 16 that in turn relied upon the rejection of Claim 4 plus a citation to Col. 19 of Gabber. Applicants note that as discussed above with respect to Claim 4 and incorporated herein by reference Gabber failed to suggest or disclose multiple elements of the claim, and those comments are incorporated herein by reference. In addition, Claim 4 does not include many of the limitation of Claim 20. Accordingly, the Examiner's attention is called to the remarks with respect to Claim 2 that are also incorporated herein by reference, because Claim 20 includes similar limitations. The additional material relied upon from Paltenghe fails to correct the deficiencies of the Gabber and so assuming the combination is correct, the combination fails to suggest or disclose Applicants' invention as recited in Claim 20. In addition, the

combination is not well founded because Gabber relies upon a proxy system to perform the operations cited. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of Claim 20.

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejection of Claim 23. Applicants note that the rejection Claim 23 relies on the rejection of Claim 20 that in turn refers to the rejection of Claim 16 that in turn relied upon the rejection of Claim 4 plus a citation to the general teaching of cookies in Gabber. Applicants note that as discussed above with respect to Claim 4 and incorporated herein by reference Gabber failed to suggest or disclose multiple elements of the claim, and those comments are incorporated herein by reference. In addition, Claim 4 does not include many of the limitation of Claim 23. Accordingly, the Examiner's attention is called to the remarks with respect to Claim 5 that are also incorporated herein by reference, because Claim 23 includes similar limitations. The additional material relied upon from Paltenghe fails to correct the deficiencies of the Gabber and so assuming the combination is correct, the combination fails to suggest or disclose Applicants' invention as recited in Claim 23. In addition, the combination is not well founded because Gabber relies upon a proxy system to perform the operations cited. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of Claim 23.

With respect to the obviousness rejection of Claim 25, the rejection pulls out a part of an algorithm used in constructing substitute identifiers by the proxy system. A substitute identifier in Gabber is not "obtained in response to enrolling for a service on said data communications network." In fact, Gabber taught that the substitute identifier was obtained before enrolling for a service so that the substitute identifier could be used to enroll for the service.

Accordingly, Gabber not only fails to teach the invention in the same detail as recited in Claim 25, but also, teaches away from the invention. The additional material relied upon from Paltenghe fails to correct the deficiencies of the Gabber and so assuming the combination is correct, the combination fails to suggest or disclose Applicants' invention as recited in Claim 25. In addition, the combination is not well founded because Gabber relies upon a proxy system to perform the operations cited. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of Claim 25.

Claims 1 to 25 remain in the application. Claims 1 to 24 were amended. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant(s) respectfully request allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicant(s).

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on February 13, 2006.



\_\_\_\_\_  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

February 13, 2006  
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Forrest Gunnison  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 32,899  
Tel.: (831) 655-0880